



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,698	08/25/2006	Darren Kidney	P30345	4508
7055	7590	07/28/2009	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			BELLINGER, JASON R	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3617		
		NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		07/28/2009		ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gpatent@gpatent.com
pto@gpatent.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/590,698	KIDNEY, DARREN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jason R. Bellinger	3617	

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 13-37.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: See Continuation Sheet

/Jason R Bellinger/
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit: 3617

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Those under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph, and the art rejections of claims 25, 29, and 30-37.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant has not addressed the rejection of claims 13-37 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph. The Applicant argues that the drawings and the specification support the claim language. However, the Applicant has not specifically provided any explanation of how the indefinite claim language is clearly shown and/or described by the specification and/or drawings. Therefore, the rejection of claims 13-37 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph remains.

Further review of the prior art versus the claims shows that claims 25 and 29-37 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, and in the case of dependent claims, to include the limitations of any intervening claims.

The Applicant argues Dunlop (GB 787,784) does not show the sealing ring in an un-installed state, and thus it is unclear whether Dunlop shows deformable sealing elements. However, Dunlop shows grooves 8 formed in the arms 7. The arms are made of rubber, which is a compressible material. Therefore, it is obvious that the rubber material between the grooves 8 are capable of deforming under tire inflation pressure to seal against the tire bead. Also, it should be noted that the DE 1,021,738 reference was used to teach the structure of the sealing elements (i.e. projecting from a surface). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would find forming the rubber material between the grooves 8 of Dunlop as projecting deformable elements would predictably increase the sealing surface area of the seal element against the tire.

The fact that the sealing elements of the DE 1,021,738 reference extend axially is irrelevant, given the fact that Dunlop shows the grooves 8 and sealing elements therebetween being located on the radially inwardly pointing surface. The references were not literally combined.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Continuation of 13. Other: The objections to the drawings and specification have been overcome in view of further consideration of the Applicant's arguments.